

Performance Evaluation of Conflict-Free Trajectory Taxiing in Airport Ramp Area Using Fast-Time Simulations

Nikolai Okuniek (DLR)
Yoon Jung (NASA)
Ingrid Gerdes (DLR)
Zhifan Zhu (NASA/SGT)
Sergei Gridnev (NASA/SGT)
Hanbong Lee (NASA)

37th Digital Avionics Systems Conference
September 23-27, 2018
London, UK



Knowledge for Tomorrow

Outline

- Background
- Research Objective and Technical Approach
- Simulation Setup
- Results and Analysis
- Summary and Future Research



Background - DLR & NASA Collaboration

Collaborate in the area of airport surface operations to jointly investigate advanced ATM concepts/tools:

- Started in 2013
- Investigate a harmonized concept of operations for surface operations¹
- Conduct simulations: independent² and integrated

1. N. Okuniek, et al., "A Concept of Operation for Trajectory-based Taxi Operations," 16th AIAA ATIO Conference, Washington D.C, USA, June 13-17, 2016.
2. Z. Zhu et al., "Performance Evaluation of the Approaches and Algorithms for Hamburg Airport Operations," 35th DASC, Sacramento, CA, USA, September 25-29, 2016.



Research Objective and Technical Approach


- Objective: Investigate conflict-free, time-based taxi optimization capability applied to ***ramp operations*** using integrated fast-time simulations
- Technical Approach
 - Adapt the existing conflict-free surface traffic optimization tool to ramp operations
 - Integrate with a fast-time simulation tool
 - Develop common performance metrics in efficiency, throughput, predictability, and environmental benefits
 - Compare the simulation results with the baseline simulation



Contributing Technology - Taxi Routing for Aircraft: Creation and Controlling (TRACC)



- Coupled with a Departure Management System (DMAN) determines the optimal surface movement plans
- Generates conflict-free 4D taxi (4DT) trajectories and calculates Target Start-up Approval Time (TSAT)
- Transfers 4DT trajectories into a speed profile with corresponding advisories for controllers and pilots
- Tested the prototype tool in a human-in-the-loop simulation environment



TRACC User Interface for Tower Controller (Hamburg Airport, Germany)




TRACC_PB: TRACC for Pushback Optimization

- Solve for optimized conflict-free taxi trajectories in the ramp area
- Inputs:
 - Prescribed taxi routes
 - Scheduled departure times and target movement area entry times for departures
 - Target ramp entry times for arrivals
- Outputs:
 - Optimized taxi speed profile that satisfies target times for departures and arrivals
 - Target pushback times for departures
- Target movement area entry time and target ramp entry time are adjusted if there is no conflict-free trajectory available




TRACC_PB for Ramp Operations



Contributing Technology - Surface Operations Simulator and Scheduler (SOSS)


- Fast-time airport surface simulation tool based on a node-link model
- Capable of modeling uncertainties, including taxi speeds, pushback process
- Common Algorithmic Interface (CAI) allows for testing schedulers independent of the model
- Has a built-in Conflict Detection and Resolution (CD&R) function to prevent loss of separation
- Used for development/testing of schedulers that can be plugged in a real-time system



SOSS Airport Model and Traffic Scenario




Simulation Setup – Baseline System



- SOSS CD&R function is used to maintain separation of traffic on the surface
- Target movement area entry and target ramp entry times are saved for TRACC_PB simulation



Simulation Setup - TRACC_PB System



*SOSS CD&R function is disabled




Traffic Scenario

Airport

- Charlotte Douglas International Airport (CLT)
- Four runways in a south flow configuration
 - RWY 18L (departure only)
 - RWY 18R, 23 (arrival only)
 - RWY 18C (dual usage)
- Arrival spots: 11, 12, 13, 22
- Departure spots: 8, 9, 26, 27, 29

Traffic Scenario


- 138 flights (medium traffic density)
 - 62 departures, 76 arrivals
- Scenario duration: about 2.5 hours




Performance Metrics

- Ramp throughput
- Ramp Taxi time
- Gate Hold Time
- Ramp Departure Flight Count
- TMA* Compliance
- Environmental Benefits

*TMA = Target movement area entry time




Results and Analysis – Ramp Throughput



Baseline system is focused on meeting target throughput while TRACC_PB is focused on achieving conflict-free taxi



Results and Analysis – Ramp Taxi & Gate Hold Times




Numbers in % show difference in average and total

- TRACC_PB reduces ramp taxi time through optimized speed profile enabling conflict-free taxi
- TRACC_PB holds aircraft longer at the gate than the Baseline



Results and Analysis – TMAT Compliance (Actual mov. area entry time – Target mov. area entry time)



TMAT compliance at various percentiles


Percentile	25th	50th	75th	80th	90th
Baseline (Sec)	17	25	41	43	87
TRACC_PB (Sec)	0	0	22	44	279

TRACC_PB's TMAT compliance outperforms the Baseline in ~80% of situations

AMAT = Actual Movement Area entry Time



Results and Analysis – TMAT Compliance (Actual mov. area entry time – Target mov. area entry time)



TMAT compliance at various percentiles


Percentile	25th	50th	75th	80th	90th
Baseline (Sec)	17	25	41	43	87
TRACC_PB (Sec)	0	0	22	44	279

Outliers of TRACC_PB's TMAT compliance is related to longer gate hold times (< 1700 secs)

AMAT = Actual Movement Area entry Time




Results and Analysis - Environmental Benefits (Departures)



- Metrics were computed following ICAO standards with the assumption of both engines running
- TRACC_PB results showed better performance in fuel and emissions than the Baseline



Results and Analysis - Environmental Benefits (Arrivals)



- Metrics were computed following ICAO standards with the assumption of both engines running
- TRACC_PB results showed better performance in fuel and emissions than the Baseline



Summary

- Both Baseline and TRACC_PB systems
 - used gate holding to shift excess taxi time in the ramp to the gate
 - sought to comply with target movement area entry times
- The conflict-free taxi solution by TRACC_PB led to less taxi times, longer gate holding, and less environmental impact than the Baseline system
- TRACC_PB result showed a slight decrease in ramp departure throughput due to larger gate holding
- Both systems showed a good compliance to target movement area entry time
 - Meets current Surface Collaborative Decision Making (CDM) suggestion: ± 5 min around target
 - However, TRACC_PB result shows a better compliance than Baseline in 80% of situations



Suggested Future Research

- Investigation of uncertainties in taxi process to provide robust taxi schedules
- Investigation of off-nominal conditions
- Flight deck analysis will be refined to balance the research between ground-based decision support tools and the flight deck automation



Thank you!

Contact

Nikolai Okuniek
Institute of Flight Guidance
German Aerospace Center (DLR)
nikolai.okuniek@dlr.de



Contact


Dr. Yoon C. Jung
Aviation Systems Division
NASA Ames Research Center
yoong.c.jung@nasa.gov



Back up slides




Results and Analysis – Ramp Throughput



Baseline system is focused on meeting target throughput while TRACC_PB is focused on achieving conflict-free taxi



Results and Analysis – Ramp Departure Flight Count



TRACC_PB's conflict-free trajectories contribute to less ramp congestion, but takes more time to flush out departures



Results and Analysis - Environmental Benefits

	Departures			Arrivals		
	Baseline	TRACC_PB	Difference %	Baseline	TRACC_PB	Difference %
Fuel (Kg)	2116.05	1739.68	17.8 ↓	2680.64	2410.19	10.1 ↓
CO ₂ (Kg)	6517.43	5358.21	17.8 ↓	8256.36	7423.38	10.1 ↓
HC (Kg)	4.27	3.36	21.3 ↓	6.84	5.59	18.3 ↓
CO (Kg)	46.28	37.55	18.9 ↓	64.13	56.56	11.8 ↓
NO _x (Kg)	9.42	7.76	17.6 ↓	11.88	10.65	10.4 ↓

- Metrics were computed following ICAO standards with the assumption of both engines running
- TRACC_PB results showed better performance in fuel and emissions than the Baseline

